REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is independent.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103; Lambert, Fitzpatrick, Fernando

Claims 1-4 and 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert (U.S. Patent 6,193,153) in view of Fitzpatrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,420,936 "Fitzpatrick"), or alternatively, in view of Fernando et al. (U.S. Patent 6,193,152 "Fernando"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus comprising a fingerprint verification means and a secret number acquiring means. The information processing apparatus further comprises a display means having a display surface with orthogonal coordinates set thereon. On the display surface of the display means, the fingerprint reading at designated coordinates occurs concurrently with acquiring of the secret number based on the designated coordinates by the secret number acquiring means.

Applicants submit that the combination of Fitzpatrick and Lambert does not teach, among other things, a display means that concurrently acquires a secret number and a fingerprint.

2

The Office Action states that Lambert teaches the claimed invention except for the claimed display surface having orthogonal coordinates set thereon and designating coordinates on the display surface related to the fingerprint reading or the secret number acquiring. Specifically, the Office Action states that Lambert teaches a fingerprint verification means (biometric comparison; transparent numeric keypad, col. 12, line 25-34; col. 13, line 62 to col. 14, line 6, lines 25-34); display means (transparent numeric keypad/touchpad; col. 13, line 62, to col. 14, line 6); secret number acquiring means, where the acquiring occurs concurrently with said fingerprint reading on the display surface (numeric touchpad; col. 14, lines 25-34, line 53, to col. 15, line 6).

In the section describing the user ID process (col. 13, line 62, to col. 14, line 6; Figure 6), Lambert discloses an _alternative_ of an employee time card application, where an employee can enter an employee identification number onto a transparent keypad, as event data, and the fingerprint of the employee is the biometric data (column 13, lines 62-67).

Furthermore, Lambert discloses an example of a home security system wherein a _numeric touchpad_ is typically used to enter a password and keys of the numeric touchpad may include sensors that capture a fingerprint of the user. The system then compares the fingerprint and the password to authorized fingerprints and passwords (column 14, lines 24-30).

Thus, as indicated in the Office Action, Lambert fails to teach a display means having a display surface with orthogonal coordinates thereon that concurently acquire a password and a fingerprint.

Neither Fitzpatrick and Fernando make up for the deficiency of Lambert.

Fitzpatrick shows a display monitor for acquiring fingerprint data that is position sensitive (Figures 3 and 4; see also column 3, lines 52-55).

Fernando shows a touch sensitive screen showing a numeric keypad (Figure 3).

Thus, neither Fitzpatrick and Fernando teach or suggest a display means having a display surface with orthogonal coordinates thereon that concurently acquire a password and a fingerprint.

Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 1. The same argument applies as well for the dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further with respect to claim 2, wherein Lambert, Fitzpatrick and Fernando, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest acquiring a secret number concurrently with fingerprint reading on the display surface of a display means, they also fail to to teach or suggest that the display surface and the fingerprint reading surface are one and the same.

4

U.S. Application No. 09/517,163

Thus, at least for this additional reason, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 2, as well.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103: Matsumura

Claim 6 has been rejected over Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Furnando, and further in view of Matsumura (U.S. Patent 5,493,621). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Matsumura

Matsumura is directed to a fingerprint ID system. In the course of registering a fingerprint, a password can be input as an index of the registered fingerprint data. In the matching process, the password is input and then the finger is examined by placing it on the image input device (Matsumura: column 11, lines 44-50).

Differences over Matsumura

The Office Action alleges that Matsumura discloses a fingerprint identification system wherein the control means activates the fingerprint verification means when the secret numbers match each other (Matsumura: column 11, lines 44-54). Applicants disagree.

Matsumura's password is not based on a designated coordinate and the designated coordinate is not related to fingerprint reading. Thus, Matsumura does not teach wherein the control means activates the

5

U.S. Application No. 09/517,163

fingerprint verification means upon matching of a secret number acquired based on designated coordinates, in the context claimed. Therefore, Applicants submit that Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Fernando, and Matsumura, either alone or in combination, fail to teach all claimed elements of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103; Angelo

Claim 7 has been rejected over Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Furnando, and further in view of Angelo (U.S. Patent 5,887,131). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

At least for the same reason as above for claim 1, Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Fernando, and Angelo fail to teach all claimed elements of claim 7. In particular, Applicants submit that Angelo fails to make up for the deficiency of Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Furnando. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 7. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103; Shieh

Claims 8-10 and 14 have been rejected over the same, and further in view of Shieh (U.S. Patent 5,874,948). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

6

At least for the same reason as above for claim 1, Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Furnando, and Shieh fail to teach all claimed elements of claims 8-10 and 14, as well. In particular, Applicants submit that Shieh fails to make up for the deficiency of Fitzpatrick of failing to teach a secret number acquiring means, secret number identifying means, and control means. Rather, Shieh is relied on for teaching elements specifically recited in claims 8-10 and 14. With respect to claim 14, Shieh is relied on for teaching menu execution level area setting means and menu execution level area designation judging means. Specifically, the Office Action directs Applicants attention to initiating display of a pull down menu, e.g., default menu, by touching a screen.

Claim 14, however, is directed to an execution level associated with a user in conjunction with an area of a menu having a designated execution level. When a menu area is designated and there is a match in fingerprint, the control means executes a menu at an execution level associated with the user, as well as at an execution level designated for the menu area (see specification at page 14, full paragraph). Shieh does appear to create a virtual pointing device based on a user file of predefined customized features (Shieh: column 4, lines 28-33). However, there is no disclosure of execution level associated with a user and execution level of a menu area in Shieh. Thus, Applicants submit that for at least for this additional reason, Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Furnando, and Shieh fail to teach all

7

claimed elements of claim 14. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103: Mori

Claims 15 and 16 have been rejected over the same, and further in view of Mori et al. (U.S. Patent 5,040,142). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to claims 15 and 16, for the same reasons as above for claim 1, Applicants submit that Lambert, and Fitzpatrick or Fernando fail to teach all claimed elements for dependent claims 15 and 16, as well. Further with respect to claims 15 and 16, Applicants submit that coordinates in Mori are designated based on a mouse pointing device (Mori: column 4, lines 45-47), and not related to fingerprint reading as in the claimed invention. Thus, at least for this additional reason, Applicants submit that all claimed elements of claims 15 and 16 are not taught or suggested by Lambert, Fitzpatrick or Furnando, and Mori. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the various rejections and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-16 is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/517,163

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs (Reg. No. 48,222) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____ #29271

Terrell C. Birch, #19,382

TCB/RWD/mag

RWD

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

9